UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Beyond Uniformity - - *Philip Schug*

Neo-Orthodoxy: Revivalism and Return - - - - - - - *Victor S. Yarros*

Literary Values in Worship - - - - - - - - - *Kenneth L. Patton*

The Church and the Heretics - - - - - - - - *Karl M. Chworowsky*

Western Conference News

VOLUME CXXXVII NUMBER 2

Chicago, May-June, 1951

PRICE TWENTY-FIVE CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Bimonthly Until Further Notice

Subscription $1.50 Single Copies 25 cents

Published by The Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago 15, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter June 11, 1947, at the post office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879."

CURTIS W. REESE, *Editor*

Contributors

Channing M. Briggs: Instructor in Sociology and Group Work, George Williams College, Chicago.

Karl M. Chworowsky: Minister of the Fourth Unitarian-Congregational Society of Brooklyn, New York.

C. A. Hawley: Head of the Department of English Literature, Ottawa University, Ottawa, Kansas.

Kenneth L. Patton: Minister of Charles Street Universalist Church, Boston, Massachusetts.

Philip Schug: Minister of All Souls Unitarian Society, Lincoln, Nebraska.

Harold Scott: Minister of the First Unitarian Society of Salt Lake City, Utah.

Victor S. Yarros: Attorney and journalist.

Contents

EDITORIAL—CURTIS W. REESE 23

ARTICLES—
- Beyond Uniformity—PHILIP SCHUG 24
- Neo-Orthodoxy: Revivalism and Return—VICTOR S. YARROS 27
- Literary Values in Worship—KENNETH L. PATTON 28
- The Church and the Heretics—KARL M. CHWOROWSKY 31

THE STUDY TABLE—
- Interpreting Great Books—C. A. HAWLEY 32
- Outmoded Hypotheses—CHANNING M. BRIGGS 32
- Deterministic Psychology—HAROLD SCOTT 33

WESTERN CONFERENCE NEWS 33

THE FIELD—
- Encampment for Citizenship 22

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion.

Encampment for Citizenship

The sixth annual session of the Encampment for Citizenship, sponsored by the American Ethical Union, will be held at the Fieldston School in Riverdale, New York, from July 1 through August 11, according to an announcement made by Henry B. Herman, Director, at the offices of the Encampment in New York. Mr. Herman indicated that a nation-wide recruiting campaign is being launched to select young men and women, between the ages of 17 and 23, who have shown gifts of leadership. The Encampment will have the assistance of several organizations throughout the country which, in past years, have provided full and partial scholarships for suitable candidates.

The project brings together people of many ethnic, religious, geographic, social, economic, and occupational backgrounds for a six-week program for more responsible, informed, and effective citizenship. The program itself is carried out through lectures, field trips, discussion groups, special interest workshops, films, and recreation. Self-government is an essential part of the practical training in citizenship. The program is divided into four units: The World We Live In, Human Resources and Human Needs, Economic Resources, War and the Problems of Peace.

The group has been composed of Protestants, Jews, Catholics, members of other religious groups, and persons of no denominational affiliation. It has included whites, Negroes, American Indians, Mexican-Americans, Japanese-Americans, foreign born, children of foreign-born parents. Occupations have included white collar workers, industrial workers, professional workers, farmers, seamen, high school, college, and graduate school students.

The $200.00 tuition fee (which includes everything except transportation and personal expenses) may be paid by one of three methods: (1) by the applicant directly; (2) by sponsorship of local organizations; (3) by application for full or partial scholarship, if the applicant is unable to pay the tuition or obtain a sponsorship.

Applications and further information may be obtained by writing to

(*Continued on page* 30)

UNITY

Volume CXXXVII MAY-JUNE, 1951 No. 2

EDITORIAL

The Ethical Culture Movement is this year celebrating its Seventy-Fifth Anniversary. Felix Adler, the founder of the Movement, made a deep imprint on the religious and social life of America. He put ethical content at the core of religion, and made ethical motivation the dominant force in social progress. The Movement that he founded has been influential out of all proportion to the number of its adherents. Ethical Culture Leaders have been in the forefront of advance in education, labor relations, and social service. The outstanding societies of the movement have been in New York City, Brooklyn, Philadelphia, St. Louis, and Chicago. The *Standard,* published monthly by the American Ethical Union, is a dignified and well-written journal of opinion. The leaders are widely known for their thoughtful and serious discussion of personal and social problems. The first social settlement in America—University Settlement, New York City—was founded by the Ethical Society, as were Hudson Guild, New York City, and Henry Booth House, Chicago. The Movement has been particularly effective in bringing Gentiles and Jews, and members of other nationality groups, into harmonious working relationship in the various local societies. It has created a minimum of antagonism in its relations with other organized religious groups. In general its activities have been on a lofty level. Of all the golden rules, perhaps Felix Adler's is supreme—so act as to elicit the best in others. The Movement has no official creedal position, consequently it is free to develop its ideology in the light of the growing thought of mankind and in accordance with the needs of the spirit of modern man. There are indications that the movement of thought within the societies is toward a broad cultural humanism, disciplined by the spirit and method of science, and implemented by the tools of the modern age. All religious liberals should be glad the Ethical Culture Movement exists, should take pride in its achievements, and should salute it as it marches toward the end of its first century.

Curtis W. Reese.

Beyond Uniformity

PHILIP SCHUG

I want to deal with a basic problem in religion, the problem of successfully living together.

Not a few liberals think that they can be religious alone. Not a few of them think that they have an individual brand of religion, and that their individual form of religion does not require that they cooperate with, or live together with, others. Yet it is doubtful if there has ever been a person who was religious by himself. In its very essence the term "religion" signifies a living together, and those devotions, those aspirations, that we cherish as our own, and to which we would give our very lives if it were necessary, are not our own except in the sense that we participate in them. All great thoughts and programs for social living are the product of many minds and much toil and suffering. The forms of social organization that we, today, hold in disrepute—yes, even hate—such as monarchy and totalitarianism, did not spring full-blown into the world. They were the results of centuries of human struggle and development, and basically they represented higher or more necessary forms of living than those that preceded them and called them into being. Just so, the forms of religion that have been relied upon in the past to give direction to the hopes, the fears, and the aspirations of men have not sprung full-blown into the world. They have slowly and painfully developed in the matrix of dynamic living. Clear evidence of the process at work was presented to us recently in the declaration of the Roman dogma of "The Assumption of the Virgin." The motherly elements of the Christian godhead are still not present on a par with the fatherly elements, but they are coming. In the last century the dogma of the "Immaculate Conception" was promulgated, and in the next, if the Roman Church remains a strong institution, we may find that the doctrine of the Trinity is replaced by a more fully rounded family godhead, a godhead containing both male and female elements together with their issue. Slowly do these developments come, very slowly, and the life of man is short and transient by comparison.

One of the remarkable elements of change that has been slowly but surely demanded by the living experiences of men and women in the Western world in the past four centuries has been the growth of democratic principles and procedures in all of life. Luther's insistence upon the religious principle of "every man his own priest" was exactly parallel to the popular insistence upon the democratic principle of "every man a king." Slowly and gradually there has arisen within the consciousness of Western man a concept of the individual as distinct from the tribe. Individual men and women have insisted upon a consideration of personal rights. They have insisted that they count for something, that they must be consulted if changes are to be made. If you are a government official in this country you soon learn that you may not make changes even for the good of the people without consulting them. Regardless of its worth a project must slowly arise out of the demands of the people, who are sovereign, if it is to last, and he who understands the plaudits of the multitude as a directive to do as he thinks best will soon feel the ire of that same multitude as they reject him for not consulting them all along the way.

This lesson is sinking in, in the area of religious thought and organization, too. The people are gradually demanding a sovereignty in this area as they are in the political. Not long ago a minister called upon a family in this city in the hopes that he would be able to persuade them to become a part of his church. It was an effort to persuade, mind you. There was no assumption that since they naturally belonged in his church they would become a part of it. Many questions were asked and answered, some of them not to the satisfaction of the prospects, for the minister failed. He reported his failure with this comment. "Well, I had to tell them where the church stood on those things. I might have persuaded them if it hadn't been necessary to tell them the church's position."

In keeping with this demand the churches in the Western world are slowly but surely being transformed in their structure and thought. Almost anyone whose memory goes back fifteen or twenty years can document this transformation a dozen times over in the space of ten minutes. No church is the same today as it was twenty years ago.

Now along with this transformation, this shifting of power to the rank and file members of the church, must go a transformation in conscience and responsibility. A consciousness of power, and the exercise of power, cannot be a wise thing unless it is directed by people who are, at the same time, developing a conscience and a responsibility that is equal to the task. If the government of a church is going to be organized democratically, instead of being imposed and supervised by a bishop, the people who compose the church must be highly dependable, thoroughly responsible, frank and open in the expression of ideas and filled with mutual respect and confidence. Democracy cannot thrive nor rapidly develop in a land whose people lack these qualities, neither can it exist in a church without them. If we would go beyond a uniformity that is imposed upon us by strong men with long whips we must develop a healthy unity that enables us to act as responsible individuals without flying apart and destroying the organization by our non-participation or by our non-democratic participation. This is the problem of successfully living together that I want to consider with you.

To bring that problem into sharp focus let us turn, in the first place, to the destructive contrast between the lofty ideals and the crass behavior that is often exhibited by liberals.

Liberals are usually very long on principles. They know clearly what they like and what they do not like, and because of this growing insistence upon democratic principles they are totally opposed to any type of enforced uniformity of belief or action.

The one thing that we most thoroughly dislike about the Roman church, for example, is the same thing that was most thoroughly disliked by similar liberals a hundred or two hundred years ago. In those days they called it "popery," and in our day we call it "totali-

tarianism." The thing we abhor in the Roman church is not the beliefs but the imposition of the beliefs, it is not the discipline but the imposition of the discipline. We abhor the roughshod way in which deviants and freethinkers within the church are trodden under foot or dismissed from the fold. We abhor the way in which change in belief or practice is prevented, or, if it cannot be prevented, is channeled and directed from the top down. We abhor the way in which all property is held by the bishop and all basic decisions made by the bishop and the hierarchy. There is no semblance of democracy about this. There is no recognition of the worth of the individual. And, worst of all, there is no evidence that there is any effort on the part of those in control to develop a responsible and powerful laity. The Roman layman is thought of as a child by the priesthood, and he is kept a child. If he tries to rise to manhood he must either be absorbed into the clergy, throttled, or dismissed from the fold. It is these things that we do not like, not Roman beliefs, though we often belittle the beliefs in our effort to demonstrate our dislike of the system.

In the same way, to take another example, we condemn Communism. The thing we abhor about Communism is not the social ideals expounded by their prophets but the way they impose their ideas and ideals. Many liberals are attracted by the idealism, but they are repelled by the treatment that deviants and freethinkers receive within the system. We abhor the way in which lip service is paid to the rights of the individual, while at the same time he is regimented and cut to a size by his superiors. We abhor the way in which the growing demand for personal responsibility, as expressed in the old democratic cry of "every man a king on election day," is subverted by forcing every able-bodied person to vote for a single slate, with no choice at all. We abhor the way in which all direction comes from the top, the way in which uniformity is imposed. There is no democracy in it for the citizen in the street. It is the rule of an elite, and we hate the very thought of a privileged elite.

Now the reason our thoughts run so strongly on these things, and the reason we are so clear on what we like and dislike in this area, is that we are participating vitally in a great ongoing movement to raise every man and woman who is capable of counting to ten to a place of responsibility and respect. The principles to which we give allegiance, verbal allegiance at the very least, are the principles of democracy in all forms of social organization, in the church as well as in the local community, the state and the nation; and we would extend those principles to the world as quickly as we are able.

Yes, we are long on principles. We know what we like and do not like, particularly what we do not like; but we are short on the personal discipline that is needed to ring in the "kingdom of heaven" which we envision. Why is it so hard to head up a community or a democratic church? Why is it that it is almost impossible to persuade the finest of our citizens to take the most responsible positions of leadership?

The answers lie within us. While we demand excellent, democratic government in all our social organizations we are not yet disciplined to the demands of such government.

A couple of years ago, to illustrate, there was a rash of rebellion within the American Unitarian Association. It stemmed from many sources of discontent. Some felt that we were coddling Communists within our ranks. Some felt that we were coddling Humanists; and doubtless some thought we were coddling theists.

How did they express their discontent? Did they use fine democratic procedures? Did they remain responsible citizens of the community while attempting to persuade the rest of us to the dangers within our midst?

They did not. They withheld all financial contributions to the association except for the necessary $5 a year membership for each church; thus they were able to exercise what they considered to be their rights within the organization while at the same time they crippled it and destroyed much of its effectiveness. They wielded the familiar "blunt weapon" of power, and democratic processes were impeded and destroyed to the extent that they were successful. They showed themselves to be non-cooperative citizens, irresponsible citizens with little internal discipline.

Few of us bother about the problems that touch our denomination as a whole. We are much more interested in the local scene.

Well, not long ago I was approached to take a public stand on a political problem. This was just before the election, of course. I would like to have done it, but as I reflected upon the limitations of my position I realized that it was impossible to personally do the job without precipitating hard feelings and quarrels within the church. Even religious liberals are very sensitive about the political behavior of their ministers; so I turned down the request, explaining why I found it necessary to do so. The scene was very difficult. The one who made the request informed me that churches should not operate on those bases, which may be true; but what was most distressing was that the requester went on to say that if this church does operate that way he thought he wanted to have nothing further to do with it.

I trust that this stand will be reconsidered; but by letter, by phone, and by personal contact similar demands trickle in on subjects as widely varied as art and taxes, and the pressure that is often implied and sometimes bluntly stated is "if this request, which is so meaningful to me, is not fulfilled or complied with I will not cooperate further in the church." It is perhaps very natural for us to react to wounded feelings with the threats, "I'll withdraw my children," "I'll withdraw my pledge," "I'll stay home." But while these are natural reactions they are eloquent testimony to the fact that we are not up to the demands of a democratic society. Those reactions are appropriate in a particular setting, the autocratic society, and they are probably a holdover from that era. When one is completely unable to participate in the shaping of policy he has only one recourse if he cannot bear the policy, and that is to refuse to cooperate. However, if one has every right to participate in the shaping of policy, and is given sufficient opportunity, the scene changes completely. He then has no right to refuse to co-operate, whether his ideas are accepted or not. If he refuses to cooperate, he is by that act attempting to bludgeon the rest of us into accepting what we have turned down after due consideration. He is by that act behaving in an autocratic and totalitarian manner, and if he succeeded in whipping the rest of us into

line our position would not only be the proverbial "hell on earth," but our democracy would be effectively destroyed.

We have high ideals, then, but we are hampered by habit patterns that destroy our ideals. We desire democracy, but we defeat ourselves by pontificating like kings and bishops at one time and slinking around like unwilling subjects at another. We are in a great forward movement, in a great throbbing, pulsating demand by ordinary people for recognition; and we have decided that a thoroughgoing democracy is the way to get it. How, then, can we change our habit patterns to bring it about? What should be the shape of our behavior, the pattern of it?

Let me, in the second and last place, suggest steps in dealing with ourselves and our problem that are absolutely necessary, and, I trust, sufficient to the task.

The first thing that we must do is to develop the habit of self-examination. The contradictions that are within us are there because they have never been weeded out. Many of us have lofty ideals, but we are like a field of corn that a farmer plants in the spring and never again looks at until fall and husking time comes around. In his mind he has carried a beautiful picture of tall green corn ripening into golden grain, but when he comes back in the fall he finds a weed-choked wilderness with a few stalks of golden grain bravely pushing through the underbrush. So it is with our ideals if we do not submit ourselves to examination and cultivation. Perhaps the first duty of man is to know himself. So seldom do we take that duty seriously, and as liberals it is most likely that we shy away from it because we realize that if we know ourselves we are going to have to take ourselves in hand.

Many of us, probably because we so resent anyone else trying to take us in hand, have rebelled completely against the demands for discipline, but you can never have a democratic society or church without well-disciplined members. Self-examination is a starting point, and it is not difficult. Put your good and poor qualities down in writing at times when insights break in upon you. Examine, on paper, the reasons for failures and successes. Learn from the experts in human dynamics the meanings presently attributed to various types of behavior. Having done these things you will have a fair understanding of yourself.

The second thing that you must do is to develop the habit of conferring with others before trying to put across your own ideas or programs. Perhaps more good common sense is beaten into people across conference tables, which are often lunch tables, than in any other way. After you have examined your proposition or your idea, and, in the process, have examined yourself, you gain measurably by having to present it clearly on more or less neutral grounds. More than that, you gain in an immeasurable way by having your ideas put to the test of other minds. You may find that a pet proposal is completely unwise, but you would never have known it if some phase hidden from your consciousness had not been exposed by another. Or you may find that a timidly presented idea that you thought would never work is given the greatest encouragement as it is discussed in conference. You learn to give and take, and you learn to compromise in conferences.

A third thing that must be done is to develop within ourselves a complete reliability. Many of us do not make good, cooperating members of a democratic society because we innately resent the idea of having to compromise, of not being able to have our own way at all times, and of having to face examination. We, therefore, rebel by forgetting things and finding ourselves too busy to get things done. We become unreliable, oftentimes sullen and uncommunicative. If we would force ourselves to be reliable, by carefully scheduling our duties and taking care of them on schedule, except in rare instances of inability, we would surprise ourselves at the pleasure and real joy we derived from successful cooperation. In the parable of the talents, Jesus rewarded those who were successful in managing small duties by giving them larger duties. It is not to be supposed that this was a punishment.

A fourth thing that appears necessary is to develop within ourselves a sense of purpose. One of the great demands of religion in all ages is to provide or to find purpose in the universe and in the associations of men. In modern, questing, and questioning men and women the old senses of purpose are fading. It is no longer sufficient to preach that man's duty is to glorify God and obey the Prince. We resent the idea of obeying the Prince and we suspect the idea of glorifying God. We think that it may have been preached overly much in order to subject us to the political or religious princes. Nevertheless, we need a sense of purpose that commands our respect. We need a devotion to something that is greater than ourselves and will last beyond our lifetime. We want to be associated with spiritual forces and movements that will shape men down through the centuries. Is not the common ideal of brotherhood, the equality of man in a well-ordered and mutually satisfactory society a great ideal? Does it not contribute purpose to our efforts? And to satisfy the necessities for mystic enjoyment is there not a sense of harmony with the universe that comes from this ideal? If we could place ourselves in harmony with the best, would we not be much happier?

These four things are offered in an effort to point a way to the goal of developing highly dependable, thoroughly responsible, frank and open people who have mutual respect for and confidence in one another. These things are offered in an attempt to further a great urge that has been smoldering in the hearts of men for many centuries. We have rebelled against enforced uniformity. We demand individuality. And we can never throw off enforced uniformity and gain individuality until we are able to move on to a higher unity of purpose and cooperation. Think of the pleasure that could be derived from living in church or in a society in which men and women could speak their minds openly, could solve their problems in concert, and in which persons were large enough to take the present defeat of a pet idea with a smile! It would almost be heaven on earth.

The idea brings to mind a thought with which I want to close. In a book called *The Liberal Spirit,* Horace Kallen presents the idea of "the orchestration of freedom." You get the picture at once. If a group of accomplished artists were to each play his own instrument just as he pleased, and all at the same time, at the symphony the result would be anything but a symphony concert. It would be bedlam. But through orchestration we get harmony. Life is like that, and if we insist upon freedom and self-respect we must be willing to orchestrate our freedom.

Neo-Orthodoxy: Revivalism and Return

VICTOR S. YARROS

There is much rejoicing in fundamentalist and orthodox Christian circles, as well as considerable boasting. We are told that there is a definite and strong trend toward religion, or God, or Christian dogmas and tenets. Agnosticism, it is asserted, is no longer in fashion among the educated and cultured minorities. Philosophy is once again the essence of theology, or theology is devouring philosophy and assimilating it. God is coming into his own again!

Partisan Review, of all periodicals, planned and organized a Symposium on Religion and the Intellectuals, and has republished it in book form. The volume has in fact received very favorable notices in the commercial and conservative secular press. The Symposium itself got exactly nowhere. It was a complete muddle. But it did establish the not insignificant point that some intellectuals have returned to something or other after decades of skepticism and free thought and rationalism.

The recent recrudescence of crude and cheap revivalism need not detain us. Any clown can attract a crowd by standing on his head, raving, gesticulating, and either praying or blaspheming. Intelligence, to say nothing of intellect, has nothing to do with this sort of religious propaganda.

Again, the recent American conversions to Roman Catholicism need not cause any loss of sleep to Unitarians, Humanists, and Agnostics. We know the converts, and we have had their confessions and arguments in print. The display of "intellect" in these is not striking. Reason is scarcely in evidence in this particular "trend." Emotionalism and sentimentality are poor assets to any religion claiming a rational basis. Certainly the Catholic philosophers and theologians insist on the solid and fundamental "rationalism" of their faith. In a recent issue of *Time,* the following item appeared in the section on Religion, and it is worthy of notice and commendation:

> "Pretended miracles" and "presumed visions" have been getting far too much attention lately, warned Msgr. Alfredo Ottaviani of the Holy Office, in the Vatican's official *L'Osservatore Romano:*
>
> "Throngs of the faithful go to the scene of presumed visions and pretended miracles and desert the church, the sacraments and the sermon.
>
> "The period through which we are going is between two excesses: open and implacable lack of religion or boundless and blind religiosity. The church, persecuted by one, compromised by the other, only repeats her motherly warning; but her words are unheard among the denials from one and the exaltations of the other."

Protestant revivalism of the Billy Graham type is not much superior to the folly, hysteria, and superstition condemned by the Vatican.

We may profitably stop to consider the motives of some prominent American converts to Catholicism. What impelled them to take, deliberately, the path to Rome? What was wrong with their Protestant faith?

Light has been thrown on this point by a book published last year, under the title, *Where They Found Christ.* From that volume we learn that twenty-nine fairly prominent Americans or Englishmen have become converts to Catholicism for some such reasons as the following: Catholic chaplains had more comfort during the war, for frantic, bewildered soldiers than their Protestant colleagues; priests console the bereaved and sorrowful better than ministers or Ethical Culturists. Adversity of one kind or another had befallen them, and their own church or denomination had failed to reassure them and bring them new hope and confidence wherewith to face life's difficulties.

What had intellect or common sense to do with such conversions as these? Not one of the twenty-nine converts could be called an intellectual seeker of truth and wisdom.

Here are some of them: Mrs. Clare Booth Luce, Senator Robert Wagner, Fulton Oursler, Frances P. Keyes, Thomas Merton, Mrs. Arnold Toynbee, Evelyn Waugh.

Neither Rationalists nor Unitarians need be gravely troubled by these converts and conversions. They are not very critical or exacting. They must have known that the Catholics believe or profess to believe dogmas, the absurdity of which is blazing. Papal infallibility and the Assumption or Ascension of Mary, mother of Jesus and several other children, are arresting examples of utter defiance of reason. If Jesus was what they had missed in their faith, the fault was their own. The New Testament is no Catholic monopoly. Doubtless what they really missed was something superficial and unimportant—incense, the confessional, etc. No intellectual is ever motivated by such trivialities. As Tolstoy repeatedly reminded us, you need no magnificent cathedrals and elaborate ritual for the worship of God, if you believe in God. If the converts sought Jesus, he, too, it will be remembered, scorned ceremonial and ritual. He consorted with publicans, fishermen, peddlers, sinners. Today no cathedral would seat him.

Let us, therefore, turn to conversions of a very different type. When a smart and tricky reporter of a commercial paper asked Einstein whether he believed in God, the answer was, "Yes, in Spinoza's God," which is indistinguishable from Nature. For Spinoza was a complete and unqualified Pantheist. That intellectuals, as they gaze at the billions of suns called stars, or think of the Cosmos, should "return" to reverential contemplation of Spinoza's Eternal Substance, is understandable. If the religion they return to, or espouse for the first time, is free from all taints of anthropomorphism, of superstition and infantilism, such as prayer for personal favors, for exceptions to natural law, no Agnostic will quarrel with them, and no Humanist will frown.

But to return to discredited, exposed, exploded ideas, to disregard the results of the Higher Criticism, of Kant and Comte, of Spencer and the remarkable group of British rationalists, from Huxley, Tyndall, Morley and Stephen, to Haldane, Russell, and Murray, is to betray a lack of intelligence and of decent acquaintance with modern thought. Benedetto Croce would hold this ignorance to be a reprehensible *moral* mistake, not "one of the head." In philosophy and metaphysics, as in science, no generation can neglect and ignore the discoveries and accomplishments of preceding generations. The thoughtful man simply cannot return to nonsense and rubbish. The clocks of the mind and spirit cannot be turned back a century or more.

Literary Values in Worship

KENNETH L. PATTON

The ministry is a peculiarity among the professions. That which constitutes its province is defined in a multitude of fashions. There is no general agreement as to what a minister is being prepared to do, or how he should be prepared to do it. This confusion arises out of the variety of religions among us, and the equal variety of the ministry which serves them. But one thing is to be found in common, and that is a pervading amateurism in the performance of the functions of the ministers.

Since there is no agreement as to what a minister shall do and how, the theological schools inadequately prepare their students for the tasks they will have to perform. Most ministers are largely self-taught in their professional functions. There is a disconcerting absence of professional standards of any sort. A similar state of affairs in pharmacy, medicine, law, accounting, engineering, science, teaching, and other related professions would result in chaos. There is some evidence that it results in a state approaching chaos in religion also.

This state of amateurism is only aggravated by the variety of tasks which the minister is expected to perform. He ends by being an amateur executive and business manager, an amateur promoter, an amateur psychologist and counsellor, an amateur recreational director, an amateur student and teacher, an amateur orator, and, most indefensible of all, an amateur creator and leader of public worship. He is a most glaring example of "jack of all trades and master of none."

Regardless of his other duties, the minister is a member of a group of professions engaged in "wordmongering." Some people are ironmongers, some clothmongers, some foodmongers; the minister is a wordmonger. He is expected to produce at the minimum a half-hour of enlightened discourse at 11:30 each Sunday morning. In addition he must lecture, teach, prepare pamphlets and letters, write and deliver prayers, responsive readings, hymn verses, invocations and benedictions, scriptural readings, occasional poetry, as well as knit all these various materials into services of worship which have continuity, structure, creative meaning, and moral and esthetic proportion and beauty.

Whether he cares for the title or not, the function of the minister makes him, at least in pretension, a literary man. That most ministers should be abysmally unaware of, unconcerned with, even derisive of, literary values is symptomatic of the creeping malaise of religion. With the flow of the lifeblood of culture cut off from the religious body by various tourniquets of indifference, withdrawal, and antagonism, gangrene is well-advanced in its several members. The wordy activities of the divines move in a dark nether world of their own creation, far from the sunlight and fresh air of the competitive public arts.

This was not always so. Only a few centuries ago the divines were the literary leaders of the tribe. The sermons of John Donne are still honored as fine literature. In ancient Israel all literature was considered as religious, as the ample variety of subject matter in the Old Testament testifies.

There are two fields of publishing in our time that are considered anathema to the profession, and for completely opposite reasons; these are the fields of poetry and religion. It is a demonstration of my personal stubborn impracticability that I attempt to work in both. The poet cannot sell because he writes too well for the masses, his works becoming too difficult and concentrated for the taste of the intellectually infantile public. The great bulk of religious writing is so dismally lacking in any literary quality or general interest that it must be subsidized and marketed to the prejudiced clientele of "party members" of the faith. This with the exception of that strange abortion of the publishing industry, the books describing how a weary humanity can attain the peace of this, that, and the other.

No live literature can develop except in an atmosphere of deep concern for the canons of literary excellence and spirited mutual criticism within the literary community. The drama contests of ancient Greece kept the playwrights in a constant ferment of striving for excellence. The brutal competition in the literary fields of the novel, drama, poetry, essay of our time, and the avid attacks of wolfish critics keep the professional writer self-conscious of the values of his trade. The furious controversy over Hemingway's latest book is a typical example.

But the preacher spouts his torrent of words each Lord's day in the sacred and protected confines of his church, and who raises a chiding voice in criticism of the inanities and crudities of his literary production? His protection operates to his own loss and decadence; preaching is a lost and ignored art in the literary world. Literary values of worship are just as far in arrears.

The only thing that saves worship from total bankruptcy is the treasure house of the past. We live like worms and vultures on the literary carrion of more splendid ages. Where would our worship be without the glorious poetry of Jewish culture, translated at a time when England was at the height of a literary renascence? Our books of common worship and our hymnals also recover for us the stately literary measures of those days when poetry and rhetoric were still in the service of the church. But for at least two centuries we have created and appropriated little but doggerel for our hymns, and the prose of sermon and prayer and reading limps and jerks in spastic contortions.

A portion of blame can be laid to our educational system, where students are no longer taught to write, and where literature is presumed to consist of the art of boredom with the chief purpose of producing those who are sufficiently stultified and intellectually embalmed to perpetuate this boredom on succeeding generations of unwilling students. But the total blame cannot be laid on the school. If we are not taught we must teach ourselves. Lincoln, with access to only a few of the great classics, developed one of the great prose styles of all time. We, with libraries groaning under the weight of the production of the ages, emerge from our studies naked of the most rudimentary garments of rhetoric and style.

To turn from our general education to our professional education is to induce involuntary shudders. That homiletics should be taught by preachers is to invite a horrible lesson of incestual decadence from inbreeding to weakness.

The state of literary values in religion invites the use of Jesus' figure of the whited sepulchre; today we might call it the gilded coffin. The cultural corruption within is protected behind the facade of faith. Because the content of religious discourse is sacred, the vehicle of its conveyance is beyond reproach. Archbishop Spellman can be the most miserable of poetasters, but he is an Archbishop still. The poetry of our anthologies of religious verse may contain a tedious parade of clichés and sentimental gaucherie, but observe the pretty morals that are pointed. We must be spiritual at any cost. Thus, behind our dishonest King's X we continue in a lazy intellectual fatness, "safe and secure from all alarm."

But a cliché continues to be a cliché still, and a lifeless and bloodless abstraction is an abstraction still, and a canned illustration is canned still, and bad prose is bad prose still, and doggerel is doggerel still.

The religious cliché is a peculiar breed. Its longevity derives partly from the magical property of religious words, their sanctification which makes them handy furniture for profanity. As articles of faith such words as God, Christ, salvation, the cross, the crown, immortality, the blood of the lamb, etc., are placed beyond criticism as words. That they are utterly threadbare and slippery from overuse, to the point that they possess no abrasive surface or cutting edge, imparting no meaning or enlightenment to user or hearer, is considered beside the point. They are not supposed to perform the ordinary function of words. They are magical incantations. But as language, they are dead and dry bones, nevertheless.

Much of our worship is composed of these clichés strung together in forms that are equally as tired with age. A friend of mine tells of preaching a sermon literally composed of these clichés, without any attempt that it should make sense of any sort. Following the service one matron, in revealing innocence, stated that she did not fully understand all that he had said, but, oh, it sounded so good! Most of our parishioners are religious illiterates, with almost no comprehension of the meaning of theological words, but they desire the comfort of the familiar tepid bath of terminology, without which they cannot rest securely in their spiritual torpor. Depart from the clichés and the congregation is awakened and disturbed, and the agony of vestigial thought processes torments them to cry out against the iconoclast who has invaded the place of their idols.

For this reason many ministers, weary of battling for innovations and intelligence in worship, turn the content and conduct of their services over to the dead hand of the past, and the palsied hand of the organist and their elderly critics. Since the old ladies are the only sure occupants of the pews on Sunday mornings, their preferences are violated only with dire results.

It is in worship, through symbolism, song, atmosphere, suggestion, architecture, ritual, and meditation that the profound, emotional, and wordless meanings are shared and communicated. Creative worship is much more important than preaching in developing the fellowship of the religious community. The sermon is an instrument of religious "profundation" only when it moves away from abstractions and intellectualization to also become an expression of religious faith and force. The sermon, in which meaning is mated to emotion, is thus a sort of poem, and it becomes dull and prosy only at the expense of its ability to move people more deeply than the level of verbal arguments. As an instrument of expressing a full weight of life, the sermon must be an esthetic reality, conveying through structure, rhythm, suggestion, empathy a significance far greater than the surface meanings of its words would imply. It seeks to invoke the same magic that is the intention of the dance, the drama, painting, music, sculpture, architecture, and literature.

When worship and preaching cease to be concerned with the media and techniques whereby these overtones and emerging myths are projected in the arts, they resign the function of the profundation of life to the arts, and leave themselves holding a bag of lifeless rites and verbiage. This, in a sentence, is the history of religion and its relation to the arts in the recent past. In the list of those institutions and regimens which have significant effect upon the creative surges of human growth, the church is an also-ran. Though they offer no adequate substitution for religion, politics, education, business, publishing, the theatre, radio and television, music and the arts exert much more pressure and influence on the attitudes and lifeviews of the people than religion. This is because religion has given over to these concerns the instruments of human influence and enlightenment.

The meanings and urgency, the living myths of life are communicated through the projection of life in all its fullness and immediacy, not through sterile abstractions and verbalisms. But these latter compose most of our worship and preaching. Where is the preacher who can compare his production with Shaw's plays? Where is the sermon against the inhumanity of bureaucracy to approach "The Consul"? Where is the sermon on racial equality to compare with the movie "No Way Out"? Has preaching ever treated jealousy with the telling effect of "Othello," or ambition like "Macbeth" or "Richard III"? What worship service stirs us as deeply as Beethoven's ninth or Schubert's seventh symphonies? What existentialist sermon approaches the plays and novels of Sartre and Camus, even the sermons of Sartre? Do the criticisms and projections of life from our pulpits ring with the waves of emotion and meaning that come from the novels of Hardy, Dreiser, Hemingway, Faulkner, and the poetry of Frost, Robinson, Jeffers, Eliot?

Our worship and preaching possess as their most fatal deficiency that of superficiality. There are only certain things that we can treat in religious services, and these in certain ways. We are hag-ridden by a host of old-womanish conventions and taboos. The very decor and manner of our services, their holy and serious mien, their air of sanctification, prohibit the utterance of certain words and ideas, and the discussion of certain problems. Many of the matters which lie deep about the roots of our common life are tacitly taboo. Severe penalties are visited upon those who dare to launch on what are called "controversial issues."

This phenomena puts us in a very suspicious position in relation to people in other fields. Statements and considerations that would be taken as matters of course in academic fields, in the arts, in ordinary social discourse, appear to be falsely daring and meaningful if broached in the pulpit. My son attended a service where I was preaching away from my own church, sitting anonymously in a back pew. At my mention of a certain skepticism, a lady in front of him gasped, "Why he wouldn't dare." How long a list could be made of things that we would not dare say in the pulpit,

but would say offhandedly anywhere else. This fact illustrates how far removed from the vital streams of our common life we have allowed our religious life to wander. It is off in a Pollyannish, quilted sanctuary of its own, a hothouse flower in a privately endowed conservatory. The list of taboos only underlines the seriousness of the defection of religion from the important concerns of the people. Matters of economics and business, both practical and theoretical, matters of political theory and controversy, sexual practices and perversions, profound philosophical issues, doubts of conventional shibboleths—both social and religious —, criticisms of public institutions, issues of war and peace—especially during a war—, the idolatry of nationalism, the destructive rifts of caste and class, the praise of heresies and paganisms as sometimes preferable to our own stupid orthodoxies, even universalism and the world brotherhood, racial equality in any but sentimental terms—the list could be extended almost out of sight. But one very important addition must be made. Religious congregations expect only the most obvious and familiar treatment of the most obvious and familiar themes. Any search for subtle overtones, for concomitants, for emerging intuitions, for deep searchings and questionings, any playing about on the growing edge of the human quest, and the criticism is that we are not joining the people where they are, that we are losing our common touch, that we are not appealing to the mass of the people.

But it is just in this strange region of emerging reality that the literary adventure takes place, as the author and the reader explore strange continents of emotion and meanings, probing always beyond the explored and the tried into that which is even now breaking open into the light of consciousness. It is in such regions that Kafka walks, and Rilke and Faulkner and Dylan Thomas. The prophets once walked there, confounding and perplexing the people, but not since the institution became more important than humanity.

But, then, the prophets were seldom developed from the priesthood. Amos was a trimmer of sycamore trees, Buddha a wealthy young idler, Jesus a carpenter, Paul a tent maker, Spinoza a grinder of lenses, Whitman a journalist, Emily Dickinson a recluse, Emerson a refugee from the religious concentration camp, Gandhi a lawyer, Schweitzer a student, musician, and doctor, Dewey an educator, Whitehead a mathematician, Laotzu and Confucius civil service employees.

The minister is removed into the cozening confines of the theological school, and from thence into the plush-lined coffin of the study and sanctuary. Who is farther removed from the crust and juice of life? The "reverend" is supposed to be seen in only the most decorous and polite places. Only certain moralistic and fruitless odd jobs are allocated to him in his community. How is he to join in the fever and struggle which are the necessary labor in which literature is born? Cluttered as his days are with back-slapping and institutional housekeeping, who can expect this timid errand boy of the status quo to erupt into impassioned poetry or prose? What could be more out of character? And when some strange misfit wanders into the ministry by mistake, and takes seriously the magnificent opportunity presented by worship, which is potentially the widest and richest and noblest of all the art forms, it is inevitable that he should be handled like the suspicious and odorous object that he is.

But there will always be a few who begin to believe the words they read and teach. For the strangest of all the perversities of religious institutions is that they endlessly slough off the dull productions of the priesthood which they carefully support and protect. Though they desire them for immediate consumption, they seem intuitively to realize that this dry fodder is fit only for cows and is best disposed of in like manner to the end product of fodder. The books of sermons plod their unread paths to ministers' shelves and second-hand book stores to the ragpicker's storehouse, and back to the pulp mill, and indeed they had never ceased to be pulp.

Then, from the prophets that the congregations and the priests had stoned in a former generation, they rescue the alive and flaming words of the strange, unfrocked brotherhood, of those innocent of degrees and the titles of the priestly nobility, and turn these dangerous words to the uses of their worship.

From Tom Paine, a "dirty little atheist," from Jefferson, a heretic, from Lincoln, an unbeliever, from Whitman, a sensualist, from Jesus, a gluttonous man and a winebibber, from suspected novelists and poets, from iconoclasts like Shaw and Voltaire, from the irreverences of Robert Burns, from the mad songs of Blake,—in time the sure ear of humanity detects the real from the shoddy, the sincere from the hypocritical, the free from the tame, the impassioned from the dead, the fresh from the stale, and these become in time the bibles of the slavish institutions.

What irony is this, that they should shelter these asps in their bosom, this explosive in their timid shelter, this glowing coal in their ashes of conformity. But they do, for religious people are above all things inconsistent and possessed of underground streams rushing in darkness. Perhaps their dull institutions are a masquerading cloak to hide the naked and furious man.

And a few hold the burning words to the tips of their tongues, and their speech breaks into a flame, and the dry temples become furnaces, and men are startled and made afraid by a new vision of righteousness.

THE FIELD

(*Continued from page 22*)

the Encampment for Citizenship, 2 West 64th Street, New York 23, N. Y., or to one of the following local committee chairmen: Mrs. Milton J. Krensky, 1040 Forest Avenue, Glencoe, Illinois; Dean Harland Hamilton, Cleveland College, 167 Public Square, Cleveland 14, Ohio; Mr. Wilfred C. Leland, Jr., 407-A City Hall, Minneapolis 15, Minnesota; Mrs. Harold C. Hanke, St. Louis Ethical Society, 3648 Washington Boulevard, St. Louis 8, Missouri.

In writing to the Encampment shortly after the session she attended, one of the alumni said: "Since the Encampment I have been on some long solitary walks trying to see the experience in perspective and figure out exactly what it had meant or will mean to me. Never have I been in a place where so many different points of view were represented. The opportunity to really probe the depths of individuals whom you were fond of, without any of the false barriers of race, class or age, was, for me a thrilling adventure. The opportunity to do this outside of places like the Encampment is rare, but six weeks *is* long enough to prove that it can be done."

The Church and the Heretics

KARL M. CHWOROWSKY

If the church were wise, she would admit her tremendous debt to the heretics; in fact, she should long ago have written her particular "defense of heresy" and have raised a memorial to heretics. But the record of the church as regards both heresy and heretics is far from being either wise or fair. She has consistently refused to admit that the heretic has often performed a much-needed task and that heresy has frequently acted as a therapeutic in church doctrine, practice, and polity.

A broader view of history tells us that heresy has by no means always been, as a partisan church history would have it, a poison in the body ecclesiastic, or that heretics have always been sinister destroyers and dangerous revolutionaries. On the contrary, heresy has commonly been a helpful if bitter medicine, and the heretic has often and effectively fulfilled the function of the gadfly, of the human goad, of the much-needed critic and censor rather than that of a social nuisance. Most people in the churches know little about heresy and less about heretics. About all they know is that the church early began denouncing heresies and persecuting heretics. In fact, church history presents an interesting documentation of the efforts early made by organized Christianity to throttle by all possible means the voices and convictions of those who dared to oppose the accepted doctrine or to deny, or even qualify, the "faith once delivered to the saints." The church soon developed her special "intelligence agencies" for the purpose of purging her body of "harmful error" and of hounding to death the "unbelievers," under which term all those were included who fundamentally differed from the official teachings and practices of the Holy Church. And this policy of heresy hunting and heretic baiting remains to this day the practical method of most churches whereby they believe they can preserve "the doctrine" and "save the elect." There is no reason to believe that the church today, did it possess the political power and the prestige it had during the Middle Ages, would not try the same techniques or follow the same procedures regarding heretics that were accepted policy centuries ago.

Of course, it would be as indefensible as it is untrue to maintain that heresy is always true and that heretics are always right; this would be as ridiculous as to claim that the church cannot err, or that any Sacred Scripture is infallible. It is a simple and easily verifiable proposition, on the other hand, that whenever truth has gone through a process of human rationalization, has been organized into doctrine and elevated to "dogma," and as such has received the imprimatur of ecclesiastical power and been invested with the authority of tradition and a Holy Bible, that then only the bold voice of heresy and the forthright dissent of heretics are likely to save truth from becoming stereotyped, from "going sour," from becoming "sounding brass and clanging cymbal," and from dying of the dry rot of formalism and conventionalism. Christian history most aptly proves this thesis. The new faith that rose on the soil of Judea, in response to the fascinating personality of the Carpenter of Nazareth, was centered in a radiantly glowing living person, and its first adherents lived in personal relation to the brilliant preacher, prophet, and saint they followed and adored. In more than a poetical sense it was true that "the word became flesh and dwelt among us." But soon another process set in, a process probably as inevitable as it was disturbing and disastrous. Once the living presence of the Nazarene had disappeared from the scene, the church began replacing his person with a set of doctrines and dogmas that were intended to become the most effective means of keeping his "real presence" alive; what they accomplished was precisely the opposite. Instead of perpetuating the Living Christ, the church now built her life around a "religion about Jesus," a theology, a system of beliefs and dogmas that had little if any vital relation to him who had walked and talked among men. These doctrines and traditions that have grown up around the person and message of Jesus finally became a "system" as difficult for the common man to understand as for the intelligent person to believe.

As this process continued, the appearance of the heretic and his heresy became necessary; and let us thank God that on many an occasion it was the heretic that showed the way and heresy that saved the church from succumbing entirely to superstition and clerical opportunism. Remember also how early in the history of Western civilization the church became power drunk and possessed of the evil spirit of conquest and empire. The Dark Ages were as bleak and barren spiritually and morally as they were politically and culturally; and let no one tell you that what saved the church during these crucial times was her "orthodoxy." It was some of her traditional teaching indeed, but also much of what in more quiet times would have been vehemently denounced as heresy and mortal error. Ever since those days, the role of the dissenter and heretic has been an especially honorable and needed one, and it continues so down to this day.

The heretic's flaming passion for truth, his earnest conviction, his fierce impatience with corruption, his hatred of hypocrisy and sham, his refusal to bow before the vain boast of authority or to submit to the arrogance of a self-righteous ecclesiasticism, these have made his task throughout the ages hard and often unrewarding, but also necessary and blessed. That many of these heretics were themselves often in error and their heresies obviously wrong does not qualify my thesis that heresy is a much-needed therapeutic and the heretic a welcome comrade in the larger cause of truth and righteousness. Hardly any of the major doctrines of the church have escaped the influence of the heretic, and it is good so. Whether it be the doctrine regarding Deity, Jesus, the church, the Bible, or the sacraments, in every instance the bold challenge of the heretic to rethink and restate these teachings has been of lasting and helpful value.

There is no need for the church to fear the heretic today. The areas of religious life have expanded tremendously these days and with them the scope and meaning of religious and moral truth. The church cannot live and teach effectively in an atomic age unless she learns to think more vitally and more dynamically than she has ever done; and that means that no doctrine is so sacred and no taboo so inviolate as to escape the

criticism and censure of the honest "heretic," i.e. the person who believes that the only method for effectively proving whether a proposition is true or false is the "trial and error" method. There is nothing more antiquated and pitifully outmoded today than a person or an institution claiming final authority and ultimate power over life and faith; and there is, therefore, nothing quite so pathetically ridiculous as attempts on the part of certain churches and their theologians to reëstablish religion on certain romantic traditions, on sweetly nostalgic sentiments, when the temper of the times demands the courage to go forward boldly and to come to grips with Life and Truth with new consecration and new fervor.

In days like these, we must welcome the heretic, be he in politics, economics, education, art, or religion. He usually has a refreshingly original point of view, brings new light, and has an infectious enthusiasm to contribute. And how we need these! The time will come, I believe, when even in the church we will hear included in her prayers of gratitude the phrase "Thank God for heretics!"

The Study Table

Interpreting Great Books

DONNE'S POETRY AND MODERN CRITICISM. *By Leonard Unger. Chicago: Henry Regnery Company. 91 pp. $3.00.*

THE BREAKING OF THE CIRCLE. *By Marjorie Hope Nicolson. Evanston: Northwestern University. 193 pp. $3.00.*

ERNEST HEMINGWAY. *Edited by John K. M. McCaffery. New York: World Publishing Company. 351 pp. $3.50.*

PLUTARCH: TWELVE LIVES. *Translated by John Dryden. Introduction by Carl Van Doren. Cleveland: World Publishing Company. 529 pp. $1.00.*

LEGACY OF MAIMONIDES. *By Ben Zion Bokser. New York: Philosophical Library. 200 pp. $3.75.*

THE HEEL OF ELOHIM. *By Hyatt Howe Waggoner. Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press. 235 pp. $3.00.*

SELECTED WRITINGS OF WILLIAM DEAN HOWELLS. *Edited by Henry Steele Commager. New York: Random House. 946 pp. $5.00.*

THE SNOWDEN DOUGLASS SUNDAY SCHOOL LESSONS FOR 1951. *By Earl L. Douglass. New York: Macmillan Company. 478 pp. $2.50.*

One of the most interesting literary trends of the present day is the return to the seventeenth century. This is due to many reasons. One reason is the feeling that the seventeenth century was a century when great genius was poured out upon the earth. Another is the sense of peace and security which the writers of the seventeenth century displayed. The general consensus of opinion is that John Donne of the seventeenth century can give writers of today the inspiration and security that is so desperately needed. Leonard Unger's recent book on *Donne's Poetry and Modern Criticism* should be read by everyone interested in following out this literary trend. Another book dealing with the poetry of Donne is Marjorie Nicolson's *The Breaking of the Circle.* This book deals with the interpretation of Donne's poetry going more into detail as to Donne's symbolism. It is a well-known fact that Ernest Hemingway's guide has also been John Donne, and McCaffery's interpretation of Hemingway is the best book on this important writer. It is interesting to note also the revival of interest in two ancient writers, the Greek Plutarch and the Jewish Maimonides. These two writers are also inspiring the moderns. Carl Van Doren shortly before his death edited *Twelve Lives of Plutarch.* This is an indispensable book. Likewise Ben Bokser has given a new interpretation of Maimonides. A book of tremendous interest, *The Heel of Elohim,* brings together the aims of the modern poets and shows their relation to the great books of the past. Waggoner's book is especially important for an interpretation of T. S. Eliot. Eliot, as everybody knows, has gone back to the Elizabethans and to the seventeenth century. His dramas follow the seventeenth century method of writing in verse, and his poetry is saturated with Donne and Milton and others of that great period. This book is absolutely essential for those who would understand the modern poets.

Henry Steele Commager has done a real service in editing some of the most important writing of William Dean Howells. Howells is the father of realism in American literature, and it is important to understand him for this reason. So far as American literature is concerned, we are in the beginning of a revival of interest in Howells.

In interpreting the great writers of the past, the Bible always comes first. It is important to remember that John Donne was one of the most eminent clergymen of his period. He spent most of his life interpreting the Bible. With this in mind the present reviewer wants to call attention to Earl Douglass' *The Snowden-Douglass Sunday School Lessons.* This is the best single volume giving an interpretation of the lessons for this year. It should be in the hands of all Sunday School teachers and all those interested in religion. It is interesting to note in conclusion that the influence of the Great Books movement has penetrated every phase of modern literature.

C. A. HAWLEY.

Outmoded Hypotheses

JEW HATE AND THE SOCIOLOGICAL PROBLEM. *By Peretz F. Bernstein. Translated by David Saraph. New York: Philosophical Library. 1951. 292 pp. $3.75.*

This book was really written in the 1920s. Its date of origin aids the present-day readers to understand some of its outmoded hypotheses. Throughout the book there is an attempt to discover motivational bases for prejudice, antipathy, and hate. The difficulty which seems to permeate the entire book is the author's thesis that human nature is unalterable. In fact, one quote in the latter part of the book says quite specifically: "We cannot change human nature."

The author posits the tenuous theory that all human beings find it necessary to express hostility or hate.

This need—its antecedent cause is not apparent—thence secures expression in group settings against other groups, according to the author. The frustration-aggression couplet is part and parcel of much that is contended in the balance of the book. This hypothesis, of course, is caught in the same logical fallacy as a stimulus-response or instinct basis for human behavior.

This book is very insightful, however, as to the Jew's position in total society. Kurt Lewin's work on self-hate of the Jew only reinforces Bernstein's careful analysis. The entire minority-dominant group relationship is well-tackled except for an almost complete lack of understanding of the necessity for, and the process of, development of prejudice along the lines of categoric contact.

The quiet hope of the author's conclusion is quite hopeless. He seems to say, on the one hand, that human nature will always find need for expressing hate by "spitting upon Jewish gabardines" and similar scapegoats; while, on the other hand, he pleads to contend with human nature as it is. Would that he read Cooley or Mead to peer into the potentials of human nature and the dynamics of its creation!

CHANNING M. BRIGGS.

Deterministic Psychology

SAINTS, SINNERS AND PSYCHIATRY. *By Camilla A. Anderson, M.D., Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company. 198 pp. $3.00.*

This is no Pollyanna book; it proposes harsh realities. It debunks the human being and almost, but not quite, makes him the automaton of Calvin's theology. Non-Freudian in theory it makes all behavior of self and of significant persons in the environment chains on future behavior.

Each person has a unique self-image, structure and function, that implies definite responses from the rest of society. Since individuals are unique, responses cannot be uniform, and disappointment ensues. Individuals cannot know or completely communicate with other individuals. Thus no one's expectations can be met except in small part. The futile effort to make the world yield the expected responses and thus preserve the self-image makes neurotics of us all. It is normal to be abnormal. We are all crazy.

Parents who read this book will find much sound advice. The danger is that, faced with being architects of their children's lives, they may be paralyzed by responsibility. There are plenty of pitfalls. If the parents are severe, the child will have anxieties and perhaps *dementia praecox*. If they are lax, the child has a sense of rejection and as an adult may overcompensate or give up. Pampering results in an adult who is anti-social or helpless. Praise the child unduly and he becomes an insufferable adult. Belittle him and he will become unable to make decisions. Parental love more often than not turns out to be parental selfishness. Parents often demand children make them happy by fulfillment of their own self-image. The reader may conclude parents should be abolished.

So far as a solution is implied at all, it seems to reverse Shakespeare by implying, to thine own self be untrue, because one's own self is so unlovely. The solution goes back to Greek tradition, Cervantes, and Pope, to admonish us to "know thyself"; also to Paul's, "Not to think of himself more highly than he ought to think." The earlier portions of the book hint at the impossibility of a person knowing himself, but at least he can become aware with Robert Burns:

> Oh wad some power the giftie gie us
> To see oursels as others see us!
> It wad frae monie a blunder free us
> An' foolish notion.

HAROLD SCOTT.

Western Unitarian Conference

RANDALL S. HILTON, Executive Secretary
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago 15, Illinois

NINETY-NINTH ANNUAL MEETING

The Ninety-ninth Annual Meeting of the Western Unitarian Conference was held at Evanston, Illinois, April 26 to 29, 1951. Mrs. George Pieksen, President of the General Alliance, and Miss Lois McCulloch, General Alliance field representative, were honored at a buffet supper given Thursday evening, the 26th, by Mrs. Ralph Hicks, a member of the Board of Directors of the General Alliance from the Midwest. Following this, "Open House" was held by the Evanston Church.

Thanks to the efficient planning of Dr. Homer Jack, Minister of the host church and Chairman of the Program Committee, and of Dr. Emery Balduf, Chairman of the Committee on Arrangements, the Conference schedule was carried out with great facility.

FIRST BUSINESS SESSION

The opening business session was called to order by the President, Dr. Curtis W. Reese, at 9:50 a. m. Friday. Dr. Emery Balduf presented the greetings of the Evanston Unitarian Church and welcomed the delegates. The following committees were appointed by the President: *Business Committee*—Jack Mendelsohn, Jr., Chairman, Rockford; Howard B. Hauze, Chicago, First Church; John W. Cyrus, Omaha; Ellsworth Smith, Cincinnati, First Church; Mrs. B. A. McClellan, Minneapolis. *Credentials Committee:* Emery Balduf, Chairman, Evanston; Mrs. Carl Schaad, Chicago, First Church; Aron Gilmartin, Fort Wayne.

Dr. Homer Jack announced the meeting places for the workshops and the place of the noon luncheon. Adjourned.

WORK GROUPS

The two work groups met at ten o'clock in the church auditorium and in Hayford Hall. Dr. E. Burdette Backus, minister of All Souls Unitarian Church, Indianapolis, led the group in the auditorium on the subject: "How to Build Interesting Programs in

Local Church Groups." Mrs. B. A. McClellan, Minneapolis, conducted the discussion in Hayford Hall on the subject: "How to Launch Successful Adult Education Projects in the Local Church."

POST-LUNCHEON MEETINGS

Following the luncheon, served at the First Presbyterian Church, there were four meetings: (1) The Alliance, Miss Lois McCulloch, Boston, leader; (2) the Laymen, Mr. C. David Connolly, Rockford, leader; (3) the Ministers, Rev. Kenneth C. Walker, Bloomington, Illinois, leader; and (4) The Western Conference Religious Education Committee, Mrs. Jack Mendelsohn, Jr., chairman.

COMMISSION REPORT STUDY GROUPS

Promptly at 2:30, Friday afternoon, the delegates assembled in the auditorium of the church to hear the interview of the Commission on Planning and to divide themselves into four groups for the purpose of studying and discussing the report of the Commission. The members of the Commission—J. Bryan Allin, Chicago (First), Chairman; Mrs. George W. Pieksen, St. Louis; Rev. Aron Gilmartin, Fort Wayne; Rev. Arthur Foote, St. Paul; and Rev. Arnold Westwood, Urbana—were interviewed by Mr. Malcolm Knowles. The remainder of the afternoon was devoted to the study groups which were led by Mr. Hadley Grimm, St. Louis; Mrs. Cameron Williams, All Souls, Indianapolis; Mr. William H. Newberry, Alton; and Mr. Malcolm Knowles, Evanston.

CONFERENCE BANQUET

The Conference Banquet, held at the North Shore Hotel, Evanston, Friday evening at 6:30, was attended by 253 persons. Rev. Raymond Palmer, Hinsdale, was the Toastmaster. Brief talks were given by Rev. John Hammon, recently installed as minister of the new North Unitarian Church of Indianapolis, and by Rev. Kenneth J. Smith, minister of the churches in Duluth and Virginia, Minnesota. The addresses of the evening were given by Dr. Stringfellow Barr, former president of St. John's College and author of *Let's Join the Human Race,* and Dr. L. J. Van Holk, Professor of Philosophy of Religion at the University of Leyden and Visiting Fulbright Professor at the Meadville Theological School.

Following the program of the banquet the delegates enjoyed a social hour of dancing.

WORSHIP AND WORK GROUPS

Saturday morning the Conference opened with a short worship service led by Rev. Edwin C. Palmer, minister of The People's Church of Kalamazoo, Michigan.

Following the worship service, brief reports were given by the leaders of the study groups on the Commission Report. The delegates then reconvened in their respective study groups for further discussion.

SECOND BUSINESS SESSION

The President called the meeting to order and asked for the report of the Credentials Committee. Dr. Balduf reported 177 registrations from forty organizations. Mrs. Schaad then read the list of organizations, the number of delegates and proxies recorded. One hundred and three delegates and 60 proxies had been accredited at that time, eleven o'clock Saturday morning.

Mr. J. Bryan Allin, Chairman of the Commission on Planning, presented the report of the Commission. He read the enabling resolution passed in Lincoln the year before, gave the reasons for the conclusions it was recommending and asked to have the report considered in three parts: (1) The By-law revisions; (2) the amendment to the By-laws; and (3) consideration of setting up sub-regions.

Mr. Lee Burkey reported for the Board of Directors of the Conference. He stated that at a special meeting of the Board on Thursday evening, the following conclusions were reached concerning the Commission's Report:

1. That the report of the Commission should not be accepted.
2. That the policy of establishing sub-regions on a voluntary basis should be approved.
3. That a Commission on the revision of the By-laws should be established.
4. That a job analysis and a job description of the office of Executive Secretary should be made.

The leaders of the four study groups reported the findings of their deliberations. In general these agreed with the recommendations of the Board although more specific in several instances. Mr. Knowles reported that his group had worked out an alternative plan which would be presented at the appropriate time.

Mr. Allin presented four motions:

1. A motion to the effect that a By-laws Commission of three be established and instructed to revise the By-laws in conformity with the recommendations of the Commission on Planning. Defeated.

Mr. Weston moved that a By-laws Commision be appointed by the Board to report at the next annual meeting. Passed.

2. A motion to the effect that the By-laws Revision Commission should include the Geneva Summer Assembly under the responsibilities of the Board of the Conference.

Mr. Schug, Chairman of the Geneva Board, offered a substitute motion to the effect that the Geneva Summer Assembly be invited to place its affairs in the hands of the Board of the Conference. The substitute motion prevailed and was passed.

3. A motion to adopt the amendment to the By-laws, of which notice had been given, providing for consideration of amendments to the By-laws at a special meeting of the Conference. Defeated.

4. A motion to accept in principle the "Plan" of the Commission for the establishment of four sub-regions, the elimination of the full-time office of Executive Secretary, and the division of Conference funds among the four sub-regions.

Mr. Burkey moved to substitute the alternative plan prepared by the study group under the leadership of Mr. Knowles. The substitute motion prevailed and was passed.

THE SUBSTITUTE PLAN

The "Plan" adopted by the Conference can be summarized as follows:

A. That the position of a full-time regional Executive be continued.

B. That sub-regional districts be deliberately encouraged under the aegis of the Western Unitarian Conference, according to criteria acceptable to the churches.

C. That the following recommendations, based upon the report of the Commission on Planning, be approved in principle:

1. That each sub-region have its own Extension Committee . . . and be given staff services from the

Executive Secretary.

2. That the College Centers Committee and work be continued.

3. That there be an all-conference planning committee.

4. That the Board of the Conference create panels of specialists in such areas as mediation, surveys, religious education, and public relations, and that such services be made available to the churches.

5. That training in churchmanship skills should be a part of the planning in each of the sub-regions.

6. That the Religious Education Committee be continued.

7. That the Geneva Conference be invited to come under the general supervision of the Board of the Western Conference.

8. That training courses for professional workers in the churches be provided.

9. That the Executive Secretary be considered to have a prime responsibility in all matters of liaison but that ample opportunity should be given for orientation and expression in denominational affairs to the churches, the sub-regions, and the Geneva Assembly.

10. That wider distribution of Conference news be provided.

11. That the Conference not overlook the necessity of continual evaluation and careful planning.

12. That the Board should discover ways and means of securing more funds for increasing budgetary items for program.

13. Major changes would go into effect only after being resubmitted to the churches.

The meeting adjourned at 1:05 p.m.

HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Following a luncheon served by the Evanston Alliance in Hayford Hall, the delegates met in the auditorium to hear a presentation of "A Church Chronicler's Rewards." This was given by Dr. Charles H. Lyttle, Professor Emeritus of Church History at Meadville Theological School, and the Conference Historian. He was assisted by Mrs. Earle Bronson, Evanston, and Rev. Kenneth C. Walker of Bloomington, Illinois.

MORE WORK GROUPS

The Conference divided itself again into two work groups. Dr. Howard H. Vogel, Jr., of the First Church, Chicago, led the group in Hayford Hall, on "How to Raise Money Better in the Local Church." Rev. Robert T. Weston, Minister of the First Unitarian Church in Louisville, conducted the discussion in the auditorium on "How to Build Membership in the Local Church."

THIRD BUSINESS SESSION

The meeting was called to order by the President at 4:00 p.m. The report of the Treasurer showed that the Conference is at the moment in a healthy financial condition, thanks to the excellent returns on investments which this year will probably average six per cent.

Mrs. Paul Caskey, Chairman, (Mr. Howard Hauze, and Mr. Richard Lassar, Evanston) reported for the Nominating Committee. After polling the churches and after due deliberation, the Committee submitted the following names for membership to the Board for a term of four years: Mrs. Robert Dubin, Urbana; Mr. Victor Seymour, Lincoln; and Rev. Jack Mendelsohn, Jr., Rockford. The nominees presented were unanimously elected.

Rev. Jack Mendelsohn presented the report of the Business Committee. Several resolutions were presented and favorable action taken upon them. In summary they were:

1. Greetings and thanks to the Evanston Church for its hospitality and efficiency in handling the Conference.

2. That the Conference interest itself in Mental Health and commend the work in this field done by the Minnesota Conference.

3. That the Conference oppose legislation which further threatens the civil liberties of individual citizens.

4. That two million tons of food grain be donated to India.

5. That the Board of the Conference endeavor to secure a larger allocation from the United Unitarian Appeal.

6. That the Nominating Committee of the American Unitarian Association be nominated by the regional areas.

7. That the Board of the Conference take the initiative in establishing or expanding sub-regional areas within the Conference.

8. That the Conference express its gratitude to the Planning Commission for its study and proposals, and for the stimulus to our sense of greater regional responsibility.

9. That the President of the American Unitarian Association should not be a member of the Nominating Committee of the Association.

The meeting adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

SUNDAY SERVICE

The Annual Conference sermon was delivered by the Rev. Julius Krolfifer, minister of St. John's Church, Cincinnati. He was assisted in the service by Dr. Homer Jack, Dr. Curtis Reese, and Rev. Randall Hilton.

SECRETARY'S REPORT

Fifty-five churches, 16 fellowships, and 2 institutions in 13 states are members of the Western Unitarian Conference. The churches have a combined membership of nearly 16,000, and the fellowships, 350. In carrying out my responsibilities as your executive I have travelled over 20,000 miles and spent at least one-fourth of my time outside the city of Chicago. The list of churches and fellowships visited, conferences, committee and board meetings attended would take up considerable of your time. Summarized, I have visited 29 churches, 6 fellowships—some of them two or more times as the situation required; attended 5 conferences; participated in some 50 committee meetings dealing with regional and national Unitarian affairs; attended 16 Board meetings of regional and national status, two meetings of the Regional Directors of the American Unitarian Association; held unnumbered personal interviews and conferences, and have tried to keep up with an ever-increasing amount of correspondence. In addition to this the office has been of service in helping to coordinate the activities and mailings of the Geneva Conference, the Religious Education Committee, the College Centers Committee, the Western Conference Branch of the Unitarian Ministers Association, the Unitarian Service Committee, United Unitarian Appeal, and others. Further, the office does the bookkeeping, operates the book de-

partment, and handles the usual details incumbent upon the administration of any organization. Credit for the successful operation of the office must go to my efficient secretary, Mrs. Carl Schaad. Her training at Meadville, her devotion to the Unitarian movement, and her genuine cooperative spirit are invaluable assets to the Conference.

There have been three ordinations and three installations in which I have participated during the past year. Those ordained were Mrs. Mary Gribben Cleary by the Free Religious Fellowship, Chicago; Donald Thompson by the First Unitarian Church of Chicago; and Kenneth J. Smith by the churches at Duluth and Virginia, Minnesota. Those installed were William D. Hammond at Grosse Pointe, Michigan; Kenneth J. Smith at Duluth and Virginia, Minnesota; and John K. Hammon at North Unitarian Church, Indianapolis.

The following have recently been called to churches: Zoltan Nagy, Alton; Hartley C. Ray, People's Liberal Church, Chicago; Alfred J. N. Henriksen, Iowa City; and John H. Morgan, Assistant, All Souls, Indianapolis.

I should like to mention all the churches that have either just completed, are engaged in, or are planning, expansion and building programs. The pleasing aspect is that it is not confined to our more affluent churches but prevails also among our smaller churches. Most of our grass roots are really sprouting.

The newest exciting development in the field of extension is the fellowships. It was my privilege to organize the first fellowship, that at Boulder, Colorado, in June of 1948. There are now some 65 fellowships, 16 of which are in the Western Conference. There will be a seventeenth next month, as an application for recognition has been received from a new fellowship in Springfield, Ohio. In watching the development of this fellowship movement it is becoming increasingly apparent that its fundamental strength in initiating new fellowships, sustaining their growth, and developing continuing leadership lies in the interest of devoted laymen and ministers in nearby churches. The initiative and continued interest of Mr. Gilbert and people of the Denver church constitute one of the major contributing factors to the success of the Boulder Fellowship. Our newest fellowship at Springfield, Ohio, owes much to the minister and church at Dayton. Our churches at Sioux City, Des Moines, Davenport, Bloomington, Indianapolis, Louisville, Ann Arbor, and Detroit are all being of assistance to fellowships. There are many other places we could have fellowships. It is hoped that more of our churches will catch this phase of the extension movement and spread their grass-root seeds to nearby areas. This is also a project that can be undertaken jointly by several churches as an area project. It has been done in the Iowa and Michigan Conferences. It could be a means of utilizing the interest and devotion of the laymen in our churches by having them assist the purely lay fellowships.

The Unitarian Service Committee has always captured the imagination of the people of the Western Conference. This year some $26,700 was raised in the conference for the Service Committee; $15,200 of this came directly from our churches. Eleven thousand five hundred dollars was unallocated, since it was money from non-Unitarians. The Chicago Area Unitarian Service Committee demonstrated that non-Unitarians will give to the Service Committee. More than half of the money raised by this group came from non-Unitarians. This is as it should be. Not that our church people give less but that they get more from non-Unitarians.

It is too early to know the final results of the United Appeal in the Conference. One of the problems our Conference Appeal Committee has had is that so many of our churches did not put on their Appeal drives until March and April. Here is another area in which much needs to be done to increase the loyalty and support of our churches. The Conference committee has given much of its time and funds to keeping in touch with the constituents in the area. However, the success or failure of the Appeal is determined by the lay and ministerial leadership in the local church. The committee can only try to stimulate enthusiasm and the acceptance of responsibility.

The Geneva Assembly is offering this summer one of the best programs in its history. The dates are June 24 to July 1. The Geneva Board, under the leadership of Philip Schug, has done an excellent job. I am confident that with the leadership of Jack Mendelsohn as the Dean you will find this one of the most interesting summer conferences you have attended.

A word should be said about your Board of Directors. It is a highly representative group, representing many points of view and every geographical area in the Conference. It has a good balance of laymen, women, and ministers. The members have been conscientious in attending the meetings and in the deliberations. I believe the effectiveness of the Conference and the Board would be increased if our churches would ask members of the Board nearest to them to spend an evening with them on problems of the Conference and the Unitarian movement. There is very little evidence to indicate that the members of your Board are called upon to report to the local church or churches, or to discuss the common concerns of the Conference. I know your Board members want to represent you but most of their knowledge of your desires and interest has to be obtained by a process of osmosis.

On several occasions I have commented on the fact that the Unitarian movement is the last stronghold of rugged individualists. It is the responsibility of us all to discipline ourselves in methods and techniques of the democratic process. In a world where the power and appeal of totalitarianism are threatening our basic liberties, in our own country where the totalitarian techniques of the big lie, trial by slander, and the deliberate undermining of confidence and the creation of suspicion are rampant, it behooves those of us who are devoted to individual liberty, advancing truth, and the democratic process to demonstrate our beliefs by our actions. All of us must rise above our prejudices and preconceptions, and work together for the greatest cause to which any man may devote himself—the enhancement of the dignity of men and the general welfare of all mankind. Let us, at least among ourselves, be our brother's brother. With devotion to this commitment and through the processes of democracy we can make the motto of the Western Unitarian Conference be not just a slogan on a seal, but a model of harmonious living — FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP and CHARACTER in RELIGION.